



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,703	09/20/2006	Tine Fatum	10532.204-US	3094
25908 7590 09/15/2011 NOVOZYMES NORTH AMERICA, INC. 500 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 1600 NEW YORK, NY 10110				
			EXAMINER WONG, LESLIE A	
			ART UNIT 1789	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/15/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Patents-US-NY@novozymes.com

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/593,703

**Applicant(s)**

FATUM ET AL.

**Examiner**

Leslie Wong

**Art Unit**

1789

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 18-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 18-41 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-505) Paper No(s)/Mail Date July 16, 2011
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 16, 2011 has been entered.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Picon et al (Biotechnology Letters) for the reasons set forth in rejecting the claims in the last Office action.

Picon et al teach a process for producing cheese (e.g. Manchego) comprising the addition of phospholipase C in the amounts claimed to a conventional cheese making process (see entire document, especially the abstract and the Materials and Methods). Picon et al also teach cow's milk as an option (see page 347, column 2).

The claims appear to differ as to the specific recitation of purified phospholipase and a decrease in oiling-off.

Purification of phospholipase and a decrease in oiling-off would be no more than inherent and/or obvious to that of Picon et al as the same components and process steps are used to obtain the same final product.

Applicant's arguments filed June 16, 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Picon et al results in reduced cheese yield.

Picon et al teach a process for producing cheese (e.g. Manchego) comprising the addition of phospholipase C in the amounts claimed to a conventional cheese making process (see entire document, especially the abstract and the Materials and Methods). It is not seen that Applicant has supplied data to support the conclusion that the method of Picon et al results in reduced cheese yield. It is noted that Applicant does not address oiling-off in relationship to Picon et al. It is further noted that Applicant claims "and/or" with respect to cheese yield and oiling off, wherein both yield and oiling-off may or may not be affected.

Claims 29-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Picon et al in view of Shipe et al (J Dairy Sci Vol 58, No. 8) for the reasons set forth in rejecting the claims in the last Office action.

Picon et al disclose a process for producing cheese (e.g. Manchego) comprising the addition of phospholipase C in the amounts claimed to a conventional cheese making process (see entire document, especially the abstract and the Materials and Methods). Picon et al also disclose cow's milk as an option (see page 347, column 2).

The claims appear to differ as to the specific recitation of phospholipase D.

Shipe et al disclose the treatment of milk with phospholipase C and D (see entire document, especially Table 3).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use phospholipase D in that of Picon et al because the use of phospholipase D in the treatment of dairy products is conventional in the art.

It is further noted that Applicant neither excludes additional components of Picon et al nor provides evidence to establish unexpected results.

Applicant's arguments filed June 16, 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Shipe et al with Picon et al.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one

of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). In this case, the references are directed to the modification of milk using phospholipases. Once the art has recognized the use of phospholipases to modify milk, the use and manipulation of the phospholipases would be no more than obvious and expected to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (571)272-1411. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Humera Naz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-0604. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Leslie Wong/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1789

LAW  
September 9, 2011